

C. Remarks

In the office action, claims 1-4, 7, 8, 11, 15, 16, 18, 20-22, 24, 25 and 27-34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph as use of a trademark/tradename (JAVA) in the claims renders the scope of the claims as uncertain.

In order to comply with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, claims 1-4, 7, 8, 11, 15, 16, 18, 20-22, 24, 25 and 27-34 have been amended to remove the word 'Java', wherever the said word was used to identify/describe a programming language, and, accordingly, the identification/description is now definite.

According to the method and the system of the present invention, as set forth in amended independent claims 1, 15, 20, 22, and 34, the distribution and usage of digital content protected by Digital Rights Management (DRM) policies to mobile devices, which are Java enabled, is achieved such that the DRM policies are implemented using wrapper technology and without a DRM agent being provided on the mobile device. Therefore, the DRM policies are being implemented in the present invention such that there is no need for the mobile device to be compliant with any DRM standards. Furthermore, the present invention is implemented without a need for installing additional software on the mobile device. The support for these recitations is found at pp. 7, lines 1-3 and pp. 24, lines 16-19 of the present application. The mobile device just needs to be Java enabled, which is capable of running all J2ME applications for implementing the DRM policies for the digital content. The support for these recitations is found at pp. 10, lines 8-11, and pp. 11, lines 24-25 of the present application.

The term Java enabled mobile device has been retained in the claims as it is

submitted that this is not a trademark/tradename usage but merely a statement of the environment in which the invention operates. In this regard it is like the use of the term a Windows or Linux computer.

Therefore, in view of the above discussion, it is submitted that the amendments in the claims 1-4, 7, 8, 11, 15, 16, 18, 20-22, 24, 25 and 27-34, are thus sufficient to remove the 35 USC 112, second paragraph rejections.

The present claims have been amended to suitably define the scope of the claims and it is respectfully submitted that the claims are now clearly patentable, and notice to that effect is earnestly solicited, If the Examiner has any questions regarding this matter, the Examiner is requested to telephone applicants attorney at the numbers listed below prior to issuing a further action.

Dated: December 23, 2005

Respectfully Submitted,

By 

William L. Botjer

Reg. No. 27,990

PO Box 478

Center Moriches, NY 11934

(212) 737-5728 (Tue-Thurs)

(631) 874-4826 (Mon & Fri)

(631) 834-0611 (cell if others busy)